

"Stanley Caress"
<scaress@westga.edu>

<vegeis@nv.blm.gov>

To

12/19/2005 11:01
AM

cc

Subject
BLM pesticide use on public lands

Comment on BLM Programmatic EIS for pesticide Vegetation Treatments in
Western United States

Mr. Amme,

1 I am very opposed to the massive use of pesticides on public lands. This
method has numerous longer-term negative consequences.

After reviewing the Bureau of Land Management's proposal for
pesticide applications to public lands in western states, I urge BLM to
choose Option 3 (C) in its proposal, and use alternative control methods,
other than pesticides. As a user (and citizen owner) of these public lands,
I am deeply concerned with allowing such a large use of pesticides on
public lands, including National Monuments and National Conservation areas.

2 An integral part of this proposal involves aerial spraying of toxic
pesticides, which increases negative impacts on non-targeted vegetation,
wildlife, and people, including recreationists, tourists, and native
peoples (pesticide application areas include Alaska, where native fishing
and plant gathering is widespread). Although the proposal claims care would
be taken in applying the pesticides in a controlled manner, these chemicals
are known to drift much further than anticipated and cause unexpected
health and ecological impacts. The pesticides that would be used include
persistent and mobile chemicals, including known developmental and
reproductive toxins.

3 U.S. biologists, ecologists and wildlife managers have a vast
array of alternative vegetation management tools to choose from, without
having to resort to applying toxic chemicals to our public lands. Please
choose Option 3 (C).

Thank you,

Stanley M. Caress PhD